

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 11, 12, and 16-25 were pending in this application. In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 11, 16, and 18-23. Accordingly, claims 11, 12, and 16-25 will still be pending upon entry of this Amendment.

In the Office Action mailed December 1, 2003, the Examiner rejected claims 11, 12, and 16-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over www.weichert.com/property/ ("Weichert") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,122,648 to Roderick ("Roderick"). To the extent these rejections might still be applied to the claims presently pending in this application, they are respectfully traversed.

Applicants' representative wishes to thank Examiner Chilcot for the courtesies extended during the personal interview conducted February 23, 2004. As agreed during the interview, the amendments to claims 11 distinguish the present invention over the prior art of record, as explained in more detail below.

The present invention provides a unique method for supplying a web site of an affiliate (e.g., a broker web site) with commercial real estate data associated with the affiliate, using a central database that contains data associated with more than one affiliate. The use of the central database enables convenient updating of the data, which provides consistent, accurate, and current information for many different affiliate web sites.

In a particular embodiment of the present invention, content is supplied from a central commercial real estate database to a web site of an affiliate by executing predetermined queries to the database and displaying only those properties listed by the affiliate or by an individual agent of affiliate. The invention provides a graphical user interface that contains a modifiable portion and a linked portion. The linked portion displays the property information resulting from the queries to the database. The modifiable portion displays content of the affiliate, which gives the appearance that the property information in the linked portion originates from the affiliate's web site. In reality, however, the property information comes from the central database.

Applicants have amended claim 11 to clarify and emphasize these patentably distinguishable features. Applicants have also amended claims 16 and 18-23 to be consistent with the amendments to claim 11. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification at, for example, paragraphs [00215-00216] and [00397-00404].

The references applied in the Office Action fail to teach or suggest the use of a central database containing commercial real estate data associated with more than one affiliate. As noted by the Examiner, Weichert does not specifically teach or illustrate property information coming from a real estate database. Weichert could not therefore teach or suggest the use of a central database containing data associated with more than one affiliate.

With respect to Roderick's teachings, the Examiner stated that e-commerce web sites consist of a database of product information and a graphical user interface through which users can search and view the product information. Roderick's teachings, however, are limited to a database accessed by the graphical user interface of a single web site. (See, e.g., column 4, lines

14-19; column 5, lines 10-14; and column 7, line 67 through column 8, line 8, which describe a single vendor, merchant, or dealership, respectively, accessing its own database through its web site.) Roderick fails to teach or suggest that the database contains data associated with more than one affiliate, enabling it to support more than one web site.

Thus, as agreed during the interview, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 11 is patentably distinguishable over Weichert and Roderick due at least to its recitation of a database containing data associated with more than one affiliate and the display of property information associated with only one affiliate. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 12 and 16-25 are patentably distinguishable over the applied references due at least to their dependency on amended claim 11.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. A favorable action on the merits is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

SHAW PITTMAN LLP  
1650 Tysons Boulevard  
McLean, VA 22102  
Tel: 703/770-7900

Date: February 24, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

ANDREW FLORANCE ET AL.

By:

  
Michael D. Bednarek  
Registration No. 32,329